Single Bench (3)

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BILASPUR**

**CHHATTISGARH**

WRIT PETITION NO. 84 OF 2005

**PETITIONER** : Kanhaiya Lal Patel, S/o Gajanan Prasad Patel, Aged about 51 years Occupation – Teacher, R/o Boys Primary School Aurabhata Distt. Raigarh (C.G.)

76/05 Sunil Shiv 07.1.05
R.R. No.
Presented by Shri

**VERSUS**

**RESPONDENTS** :

1. State of Chhattisgarh, Secretary Education Department D.K.S. Building Raipur (C.G.)

2. District Education Officer, Raigarh (C.G.)

COPY 05
Bilaspur

3. The Collector, Raigarh (C.G.)

4. The Principal, Middle School, Aurabhata Tahsil & Distt. Raigarh (C.G.)

10/15

**WRIT PETITION U/S 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA**

(27)

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

मामला क्रमांक W.P. No. 84/05 सन् 200

आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)

| आदेश का दिनांक तथा आदेश क्रमांक | हस्ताक्षर सहित आदेश | कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अंतिम आदेश |
|---|---|---|
| | **28/01/2005**<br>Smt. Indira Tripathi, counsel for the petitioner.<br>Shri Akhil Agrawal, P.L. for the State.<br>Heard on I.A. No. 214/2005 for urgent hearing. It is allowed.<br>The instant petition has been filed by the petitioner on the ground that he had challenged the transfer order of Annexure P-1 by filing a Writ Petition No. 2560/2004 which was disposed of by this Court vide order dated 20/08/2004 with a direction to the respondents to decide the representation submitted by the petitioner within six weeks.<br>Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he submitted the representation vide Annexure P-4 and P-7 but the same has not been decided by the respondents despite categorical direction by this Court. The document of Annexure P-5 establishes that the representation of the petitioner is under consideration. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the period of six weeks by which the representation was to be decided is already over. Even then they have not decided the representation and it is as such a violation of the Court's order. However, it is prayed that respondents should be further directed to decide the representation of the petitioner which is pending.<br>I have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner.<br>The order of Annexure P-2 passed by this Court is very specific and clear and if the petitioner is aggrieved by non compliance of the above order, he is at liberty to move suitable | |

Gr. PRJ—FS/350—12/2000—50,000.

(28)

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

मामला क्रमांक W.P. No. 84/05 सन् 200

आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)

| आदेश का दिनांक तथा आदेश क्रमांक | हस्ताक्षर सहित आदेश -2- | कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अंतिम आदेश |
|---|---|---|
| | application under the law and second petition of similar relief that is for direction to the respondents to consider the representation of the petitioner is not maintainable and accordingly, the petition is dismissed.<br>Consequently, I.A. No. 214/2005 stands disposed of.<br>**Sd/-**<br>**Dhirendra Mishra**<br>**Judge** | |

Gr. PRJ—FS/350—12/2000—50,000.

22.2.05